



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

in the case of the Sacrifice of the Mass? We unhesitatingly answer, they are not. There is an utter deficiency, an absolute absence of all proof in the New Testament. There is no trace of a sacrifice in the words of institution. "Do this in remembrance of me" cannot by any rules of interpretation be made to mean, offer me as a propitiatory sacrifice, in an unbloody manner, for the sins of the living and the dead. Neither is there any trace of this doctrine in the descriptions of or allusions to the Eucharist in any part of the New Testament. St. Paul says:—"For as often as you shall eat this bread, and drink the chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord till He come." 1 Cor. xi., 26 (Douay). Here is a representation and memorial of the Lord's death, and consequently of his sacrifice, but no offering of a propitiatory sacrifice itself. And again the same Apostle in the same Epistle, ch. x. 16 (Douay), says: "The chalice of benediction which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? And the bread, which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord?" The faithful communicant feeds on the sacrifice already offered up. He spiritually eats the flesh of Christ, and drinks his blood (or literally does so, if you will); but he offers no propitiatory sacrifice in it to God for his own sins, or those of others: neither does the officiating minister. And as there is no trace of a sacrifice in the new law, except that on the cross; so is there none of a sacrificing priest under that new law, except the Lord Jesus. The term, "*ιερεως*," which means a sacrificing priest, and is applied to those under the law, and to our Saviour, is never applied to the ministers of the New Testament. For this doctrine, then, which claims to be one of the new law, there is no evidence in the New Testament, and in default, its advocates turn to the old; and as the result, produce two passages; one a supposed prophecy of the Mass, which I considered in my former letter: the other a supposed type, which I did not notice in that, because, though quoted occasionally, it is not in general much relied on, and because, also, though the argument from it is little to the point, yet the answer would have added considerably to the length of my letter. But should your kindness allow me again a space in your valuable publication, I shall endeavour so far to supply this apparent omission, by noticing at present the text in question. Your readers will, no doubt, anticipate me in my quotation, and will know at once I refer to Genesis xiv., 18. In the Authorized Version it is as follows:—"And Melchisedek, king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine, and he was priest of the Most High God, and he blessed him." In the Douay translation:—"But Melchisedek, the king of Salem, bringing forth bread and wine, for he was the priest of the Most High God, blessed him, and said, &c." There are several differences here between the two translations; one of them a very material one, where the word translated "*and*" in the Authorized is in the corresponding place rendered "*for*" in the Douay Version. This difference essentially alters the meaning; for, according to the Douay, the reason why Melchisedek brought forth bread and wine was because he was the priest of the Most High God; and, therefore, what he brought forth was intended not for the refreshment of Abram and his followers, but as a religious oblation offered to God in virtue of his priestly office.

The word *and* in the Authorized Version implies only the fact that he was the priest of the Most High God. Which is the correct rendering? In the Authorized, the same word is translated in the same way in all the places it occurs in verses 18 and 19; in the Douay it is rendered differently—in the 19th verse, "*and*," as it is in the Authorized—in the 18th verse, "*but*" and "*for*." "*And*," is the correct translation of the original word, and the change to "*for*" seems to denote "a foregone conclusion," and made to suit a purpose. My first argument against the Roman Catholic application and interpretation of the passage is drawn from this most serious mistranslation. In the next place, granting that the bread and wine were an oblation—was it propitiatory or otherwise? If it be said propitiatory, then Scripture is contradicted, which authoritatively and solemnly enunciates as an everlasting truth, "without shedding of blood is no remission" or propitiation. If not a propitiatory sacrifice, how could the bread and wine be a type of a propitiatory sacrifice? The type in the point of resemblance cannot be essentially different from the antitype. Thus, the animals sacrificed under the law were types of Jesus, and the essential feature of resemblance was the shedding of the blood: without this feature they could not have been types of his sacrifice. By a parity of reasoning, the Mass cannot be a propitiatory sacrifice, because the type is not one; and thus the passage, on their own interpretation, disproves what it was brought forward to prove. Now, the plain and sound exposition of the text is, that Melchisedek brought forth bread and wine to refresh Abram and his followers, on their return from the slaughter of the kings; for, be it remembered (what seems to be forgotten by the advocates of the other interpretation) that Melchisedek was a king as well as a priest, and that, as king, he was a party interested in Abram's victory, and also able to provide suitable entertainment for so large a party, which an humble priest might not have had the means to do. Like the king of Sodom, he came forth to congratulate Abram on his success, and express his own obligations to him for it. But he was a priest as well as a king, and as such, he blessed Abram. Herein was the execution of his priestly office: as the priests under the law

of Moses were enjoined solemnly to bless the people, for which purpose also a form of words was prescribed. (See Numbers vi. 23-27—Douay.) In the whole of this interpretation we are borne out by St. Paul, in his comment on the circumstance in the Epistle to the Hebrews, c. vii. vv. 1, 6, 7—(Douay). The Apostle dwells there on the fact of Melchisedek's blessing Abram, and from that infers the superiority of the former over the latter; but he makes no mention whatever of the bread and wine. If they had had any spiritual or religious meaning, and one so important as that alleged, would the Apostle have been totally silent on it? Whereas, on the supposition of the other interpretation, it would have been quite natural for the inspired writer, treating exclusively on spiritual subjects, to omit noticing that part of the narrative that referred to a merely temporal one. Such are the two passages—this and the one in Malachias noticed in my former letter—taken out of the whole Bible; and every candid reader must admit that they are utterly insufficient to give any proof of the truth of the Mass. But a mystery, and one so important as this, should, even above other doctrines, be established on clear and sufficient evidence to demonstrate its truth. Therefore, the conclusion from the whole is, that the so-called mystery of the Mass, possessing no scriptural evidence deserving the name, is unscriptural, and, consequently, untrue.

Anything further in this line of argument might seem unnecessary after what has been said; but it may tend to the fuller establishment of our proof to examine the internal claims; the Mass has to be considered a true mystery; its advocates claim to have it judged, not so much by the canons of common reason, as by the rules that regulate a mystery. We shall give a definition of a mystery that we hope will be found unobjectionable. A mystery, then, is an article of faith, above our reason, but not contradictory to it, where our reason can judge. It should not have plain contradictions—that is, contradictions judged according to the definition. We maintain that there are such in the Mass. Is it not a contradiction to say that the sacrificial act in the Mass is unbloody, and at the same time propitiatory, when they admit without shedding of blood there is no remission. Again, the sacrificial act is unbloody, and yet, at the same time, bloody; for if it is not bloody, there is no propitiation, and if it be bloody, it is not the Mass, which is defined to be an unbloody sacrifice.

There is also a manifest contradiction involved in the assertion that while each consecrated Host, and each part, though it were broken into a thousand fragments, be Christ whole and entire, yet that these fragments, innumerable as they are, are not many, but one; with other contradictions I need not mention. There is no revealed mystery in the doctrine, but a grafting of error on truth; and every attempted explanation is only a vain struggle to reconcile this error with Holy Scripture and reason, each producing greater inconsistencies than the other, just as an addition by another hand to a building of perfect symmetry betrays at once its incongruity to any eye of right taste and judgment, notwithstanding all the efforts of some prejudiced or interested parties to prove that it formed a portion of the original structure.

And, in conclusion, I would beg earnestly to add, that thus to corrupt the plain simplicity of the solemn ordinance of the Eucharist, and to create mysteries where God has made none, is, besides requiring men to believe error instead of the truth, calculated also to multiply difficulties and stumbling-blocks in the way of earnest inquirers, and expose Christianity to the insults of infidels and bring it into contempt.

Yours, &c.,

F. H.

ON THE SUPREMACY OF ST. PETER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—On reading over your last essay relative to the claims put forth by the Roman Catholics for the supremacy of Peter over all the other Apostles, and the several places where Peter is placed only on the same level with the rest of the Apostles by our Lord Himself, as well as in the estimation of all the rest, I cannot but think that, had the supremacy of Peter been recognized by the Apostles, we should not find Paul using the following statement in his Epistle to the Galatians (ch. ii., ver. 6):—"For of those who seemed to be something (evidently meaning James, Cephas, and John), (as in the 9th ver.) what they were sometime, it is nothing to me; God accepteth not the person of men; for to me they that seemed something added nothing. (7th verse) But, contrariwise, when they had seen that to me was committed the Gospel of the uncircumcision, as to Peter that of the circumcision; (9th verse) And when they had known the grace that was given to me, James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should go unto the Gentiles and they unto the Circumcision." (Rheims version.)

What I beg your attention to is the order or sequence in which Paul places these three names, viz., James first, Cephas (i.e., Peter) second, and John third; evidently showing, that St. Paul, 18 years after his conversion, and having constant intercourse with the Apostles, should thus place them, and did not give St. Peter the pre-eminence.

James, Cephas, and John were those three whom our Lord particularly distinguished during His ministry, and, we may suppose, were pre-eminently prepared to

take a prominent part in the future affairs of His Church; but St. Paul evidently disallows St. Peter's pre-eminence here, by giving him the second place only in the ministry. This also contradicts those who say that as Peter is *always* mentioned first in a catalogue of the Apostles, he must be foremost in rank.

But we have here even a stronger evidence that St. Peter had not this pre-eminence; for St. Paul, after thus enumerating these three Apostles, in the sequence already quoted, immediately remarks, "that they three seemed to be pillars." Seemed to be! Surely, if Peter, or even all these three, had any superior authority given them, the Apostle Paul would here have expressed it, and submitted to their authority, which he did not; but acted an independent part through the whole course of his ministry. And, why, if Peter was to be head of the Gentile Church, were not the arrangements exchanged? Or why was not Peter associated with Paul in his conversion of the Gentiles? Surely, such an arrangement would have taken place if the Holy Ghost had intended that Peter should be pope.

On speaking to a Roman Catholic gentleman on this subject, and asking him why Peter was placed only second, he said that it was of no consequence how he was there placed. I said, "Suppose we were to speak of three persons of rank, and to say, 'the Duke of Wellington, George the Fourth, and Earl Grey, said so-and-so,' would not every one cry out shame? But," said I, "how can you account for the Apostle Paul's ignorance in not knowing that even the above three Apostles were only *seemingly* pillars?" This, he acknowledged, he could not account for, and should consult some priest of sufficient intelligence! And I doubt if any other fair answer can be given than that it upsets Peter's title to be the Head of the Church on earth, whether by the title of God's Vicegerent, His Holiness, or the Pope.

Protestants are too apt to concede that St. Peter was for any time in Rome, or there at all, in opposition to the several Epistles written by St. Paul from Rome, and his epistles to the Romans—in none of which St. Peter is saluted, or any salutations from him. We are told it might have been dangerous to mention St. Peter's name in these salutations! Surely, in letters which were not to be opened till they reached their distant destination, this could not be the reason. And it was as dangerous for St. Paul to mention his own name, as he does in every one of them, as also those residing and inmates in Cæsar's and Aristobulus' (King Herod's son) houses. Besides, St. Peter directs his epistle from Babylon, at the very time they say he was at Rome. "Oh!" they say, "Babylon means Rome;" but they won't allow that title to be applied to her in the Revelations, in her future persecution of the saints. "But," say others, "how can Babylon mean the city of Babylon, which was then in ruins?" But, on referring to Josephus, he mentions Babylon (evidently a new city called after the old), situate on the Tigris, and in which there were, as well as in several contiguous cities and ports, a great number of Jews resident. He mentions a high priest having been put out of office by King Herod escaping to Babylon or the neighbouring cities, and made chief priest over that region.

No doubt, in consequence of Rome being the metropolis of the world, attempts were early made to induce a belief that Peter was appointed Pope; but we have no evidence at all, except records evidently fabulous and documents interpolated to say what the writers themselves were ignorant of.—Yours, &c.,

A READER OF THE BIBLE.

FARM OPERATIONS FOR DECEMBER.

Wheat.—As the storing of the roots is proceeded with, let the land be prepared as directed last month, and sown with wheat, if suited to its cultivation, using some one of the steepens named in our last calendar for the prevention of smut.

Winter Vetches, when not sown in sufficient breadth last month, may be sown early this month, mixed with rye or winter oats.

Winter Barley, Bere, or Rye may still be sown either as soling or for grain.

Early Potatoes, if not planted in sufficient breadth, may still be proceeded with in dry, open weather. At this time of the year they are best cultivated in lazy bed, from 4 to 6 feet wide, and require a liberal dressing of stable dung, and about 6 inches of cover from the furrows, to keep out frost. Early Oxfords, Cumberland bangors, and kemps are the kinds most suited for planting now, and come in early.

Parsnips and Carrots, to come in early, may now be sown: the land should be deeply tilled and well manured with rich compost or decomposed dung, and be well incorporated with the soil, to grow those roots to perfection.

Meadows and Grass Lands should be highly manured during this and the succeeding months with marl, loamy gravel, bones, farm-yard manure, or rich composts, taking care not to trespass on them with carts in very wet weather. When the manures are spread, and dry enough, they should be well bush-harrowed and rolled.

Ploughing.—All stubble lands should be well and deeply ploughed during the month. Lea lands intended for green crops should also be ploughed up, to allow time for the sods to rot before cross-ploughing in the spring.